

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,243	03/14/2001	Richard Muhlbacher	LEAR 0835 PUS	4800
7	590 11/22/2004		EXAM	INER
Christopher W. Quinn			THOMPSON, CAMIE S	
Brooks & Kushman P.C.				<u> </u>
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Southfield MI 48075-1351			1774	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/808,243	MUHLBACHER ET AL.				
1	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Camie S Thompson	1774				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 03 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin is FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF						
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsiderátion has been consi <u>e Continuation Sheet</u> .	dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment( explanation of how the new or amended claims wo						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>23</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>5,8,9,13,15-17,19,20,24 and 25</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-7,10-12, 14, 18 and 22</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approximately approximatel	oved or b)  disapproved by tl	ne Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen						
10. Other:		BEALA DIVE				
· 	SUPERVIS	RENA DYE SORY PATENT EXAMINER				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner regrets inadvertently omitting claim 22 in the rejection dated September 22, 2004. Claim 22 should have been included in the Caudill rejection. Applicant defines the interior lining component as being intended for a roof lining. Caudill discloses a cover layer that comprises a decorative material that is applied to a two-layer foam laminate. Additionally, the reference discloses a intermediate layer that may be under the cover material. The reference discloses the same product as recited in instant claim 1. The intended use of the product does not make the product of the Caudill reference different from the recited product in instant claim 1. The Caudill rejection is maintained..